



SCHOOL OF LAW

UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA • IRVINE

Legal Studies Research Paper Series No. 2019-17

Intentional Invisibility: Professional Women and the Navigation of Workplace Constraints

Swethaa S. Ballakrishnen

sballakrishnen@law.uci.edu

University of California, Irvine ~ School of Law

Priya Fielding-Singh

priyafs@stanford.edu

Stanford University

Devon Magliozzi

dmaglioz@stanford.edu

Stanford University

The paper can be downloaded free of charge from SSRN at:

1

2 INTRODUCTION

3 Research on the persistence of gender inequality in the workplace focuses on two
4 explanations for women's underrepresentation in the top tier of organizations: structural
5 barriers to promotion (e.g., Elliot and Smith 2004; Gorman and Kmec 2009; Kanter 1993;
6 Miller 1976) and gendered behaviors internalized through socialization (e.g., Coltrane
7 1996; Helgesen 1990). Scholars concur that there is a recursive relationship between
8 structure and socialization (Alvesson and Billing 1997; Ridgeway and Correll 2004),
9 meaning that in organizations, one's position impacts one's behavior and vice versa. Yet,
10 little is known about the processes through which organizations encourage and
11 employees adopt specific behavioral strategies that contribute to gender inequality. Our
12 research advances this growing scholarship (e.g., Blair-Loy 2009; Reid 2015; Williams
13 and Dempsey 2014) by theorizing how women select strategies to respond to structural
14 constraints in the workplace, and how the strategies they select may unwittingly reinforce
15 extant inequalities.

16 We use in-depth interview and observational data from two cohorts of a women's
17 professional development program at a large non-profit organization in the western
18 United States to examine how professional women strategically balance workplace and
19 familial demands. We find that women facing structural constraints, such as unequally
20 distributed household responsibilities and gender biased organizational policies, adopt a
21 low-risk strategy of conflict avoidance that we call "intentional invisibility." Women in
22 our sample demonstrate three interrelated motivations for embracing intentional
23 invisibility: they use it to resolve dissonance between professional and personal

identities; straddle the double bind they face at work, in which women are penalized for assertiveness while professional advancement requires it; and accommodate a disproportionate share of familial responsibilities. While our data alone cannot support a causal link between intentional invisibility and long-term career outcomes, when considered alongside research demonstrating the importance of visibility to professional advancement (e.g. Correll and Mackenzie 2016; Ibarra 2012; King et al. 2017; Leahey 2007; Simmard et al. 2008), our findings suggest that this strategy for navigating workplace bias may be detrimental to gender parity.

BACKGROUND

Gendered Barriers in the Workplace

Women have entered the U.S. workforce in droves since the mid-twentieth century. Middle class, educated women in particular have seen substantial gains as they have infiltrated managerial and professional positions (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman 2009). Yet, even as they have entered previously male-dominated occupations, white-collar women remain underrepresented in top-level professional positions (Ely and Rhode 2010). A historical explanation for the underrepresentation of women in senior positions was the “pipeline” problem—that not enough qualified women were available to make the transition to positions of power (Eagly and Carli 2008). However, as gender-equal rates of entry across many workplaces have failed to result in equal representation at senior levels (Kulis, Sicotte and Collins 2002), the pipeline hypothesis has been increasingly discredited. Likewise, the popular metaphor of the “glass ceiling,” which

46 implies that women seeking career advancement come up against a barrier impeding
47 access to top positions, does not map onto the ongoing, complex barriers to advancement
48 that women face. By blocking access to leadership, the glass ceiling allegedly resigns
49 women to a professional plateau or encourages them to “opt out” of the race altogether
50 (Belkin 2003), but evidence that women self-select out of competitive career tracks is
51 weak (Goldin 2006). Further still, the linear metaphor suggesting that women have only
52 one juncture in their careers where they are stymied fails to encapsulate the range of
53 persistent and subtle barriers that women face *throughout* their career paths.

54 Instead, researchers have begun to converge on the argument that it is pervasive,
55 structural problems that are at the root of women’s underrepresentation (Ely, Ibarra, and
56 Kolb 2011; Monroe and Chiu 2010). This argument has pushed scholarship towards
57 “subtle” and “unseen” barriers as a way of explaining the scarcity of women in positions
58 of senior leadership (DeRue and Ashford 2010; Ibarra and Petriglieri 2007; Kolb 2013).
59 To describe the barriers impeding women’s career trajectories, Eagly and Carli (2007)
60 replace the singular image of the glass ceiling with one of a labyrinth: though women are
61 no longer uniformly barred from the C-suite, their paths to leadership are riddled with
62 biases, discrimination, and other obstacles. In this updated metaphor, women do not
63 merely leave organizations or stagnate professionally when they encounter an obstacle.
64 Instead, women who find themselves caught in a convoluted web are forced to navigate it
65 continuously as they confront recurring instances of organizational bias.

66
67 *Navigating Structural Constraints*

68 As women navigate biased organizations, gender is constantly operating as a
69 “background” identity that shapes individual choices, organizational processes, and
70 institutional beliefs and arrangements (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). In professional
71 settings, widely shared expectations about gender leave women in a conundrum. On the
72 one hand, women are expected to fit into environments that are predominantly structured
73 with men in mind (Acker 1990; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Williams 2000). At the same
74 time, when women *do* conform to expectations about the masculine, ideal worker, these
75 behaviors are not well received (Rudman and Glick 2001; Rudman et al. 2012). As a
76 result, women are stuck in a double bind, where those who demonstrate masculine traits
77 face backlash while those who lack them risk being dismissed (Eagly and Carli 2007).

78 The double bind manifests across the professional hierarchy. At more senior
79 levels of professional organizations, abstract ideals are more strongly associated with
80 stereotypically masculine traits, such as assertiveness and dominance, than in lower
81 levels of management and administration (Acker 1990; Ridgeway and Correll 2004). For
82 example, many professional development training programs routinely advise women
83 towards masculine typed behavior, such as interjecting at meetings, speaking with
84 authority, and self-promoting. Yet, when women do these things, especially from
85 positions of power, they are deemed “control freaks” (Eagly and Carli 2007) and chided
86 for not being modest enough (Kendall and Tannen 1997). Meanwhile, women in the
87 workplace are expected to be more likeable than men, and are penalized for being
88 “deceitful, pushy, selfish and abrasive” when they violate feminine norms (Heilman et al.
89 2004). As Eagly and Carli (2008) point out, this creates a no-win situation where women

are thought of as not having the “right stuff” for powerful jobs regardless of whether they act in communal or agentic ways.

Alongside the double bind, women face “the second shift” – after confronting workplace challenges, they return home to a disproportionate amount of familial responsibilities (Hochschild 1989). Research has shown time and again that this inequality in unpaid domestic labor remains a roadblock to women’s advancement in the paid labor force (Bianchi et al. 2012; Coverman 1983; Sayer 2005; Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson 2004). Even in heterosexual families in which both partners work full time, wives report doing twice as much housework and childcare as their husbands (Coltrane 1996). Together, these inequalities at home and in the workplace produce a “frozen” middle management tier comprised of women who are not leaving the workforce, but also are not likely to ascend to leadership in their professional environments (Yee et. al. 2016).

To address these complex and often competing structural constraints, professional women across contexts employ a range of navigational tools. While the labyrinthine obstacles facing professional women are well documented, less is known about women’s navigational strategies. Scholars have highlighted the importance of cultivated identities in allowing people to navigate the organizations they are embedded in (Ibarra 1999; Ibarra and Petriglieri 2007; Pratt et al. 2006; Ramarajan and Reid 2013, 2016). Many organizations expect employees to perform a kind of idealized professional identity (Acker 1990; Britton 2000; Williams 2000) that rewards work prioritization (Blair-Loy 2009; Kellogg 2011) and penalizes family prioritization (Cooper 2000).

Indeed, despite the proliferation of new kinds of “flexible” work, women are often marginalized when they select family-friendly work arrangements (Glass 2004; Hochschild 1997; Kelly et al. 2010). To reconcile competing work and non-work expectations, many women professionals choose between *accepting* organizational pressures, *passing* as someone they are not, or *revealing* their true identities despite consequences (Ramarajan and Reid 2016).

THE CURRENT STUDY: STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS AND INTENTIONAL INVISIBILITY

While women are constrained by biased organizations, their individual choices and preferences, cultivated during years of socialization within gendered structures, also contribute to inequality (Correll 2001; Correll 2004; Cech and Blair-Loy 2010). Faced with professional norms that encourage masculine behavior, many women choose to modify their behaviors and networks to match those of male counterparts (Blair-Loy 2009; Davies-Netzley 1998; Ramarajan and Reid 2013, 2016; Reid 2015). Our study reveals an alternative strategy that some professional women embrace when confronted with conflicting organizational and familial expectations.

We contribute to the growing body of work on how women navigate biased organizations by examining how women use intentional invisibility to respond to workplace bias while rejecting masculine professional norms. Unlike *accepting*, *passing*, or *revealing*, intentional invisibility offers women a way to balance professional and personal demands while projecting an authentic sense of self. By remaining behind the

134 scenes and valuing communal, collaborative work, women who embrace intentional
135 invisibility reject – rather than seeking to embody – the masculine norm of the ideal
136 worker. The women in our study who embrace invisibility often acknowledge that doing
137 so may limit their opportunities for advancement, but nonetheless turn to the strategy to
138 avoid conflict, project an authentic self, and gain a sense of stability.

139 While research demonstrates the importance of visibility to professional
140 advancement (Correll and Mackenzie 2016; Ibarra 2012; Simmard et al. 2008), we found,
141 in keeping with past research, that even as women expressed professional ambition they
142 were unlikely to seek visibility (King et al. 2017). The women in our sample recognized
143 that seeking visibility is a conventional strategy for climbing the organizational ladder,
144 but described remaining behind the scenes as a personally satisfying and professionally
145 strategic option. Our data show three, interrelated motivations for embracing intentional
146 invisibility in spite of its potential costs. First, intentional invisibility enabled women in
147 the professional development program we tracked to avoid conflict with both their
148 managers and the teams they managed within the context of a biased organization.
149 Second, women in our sample used invisibility to reconcile their personal identities with
150 their workplace selves, reporting that staying behind the scenes felt more authentic than
151 assuming the spotlight. Finally, remaining invisible allowed women to quietly pursue
152 feminist goals and aspirations at work without falling behind on the feminine demands of
153 their modern partnerships.

154 We focus on participants' stated preferences for and interpretations of invisibility
155 to add nuance to accounts of how women navigate biased organizations. The women in

our organization were not passively pushed and pulled by organizational tides; they were active agents making daily tactical choices in interactions with co-workers and long term strategic choices in light of organizational structures. At the same time, the women we followed did not create the workplace labyrinth that they were obliged to navigate, and they were not at liberty to redesign it from the ground up. By emphasizing women's preferences and choices, we do not mean to suggest that they are responsible for the unequal work environments they inhabit or the curtailed career trajectories they may experience. Attaining gender parity in top tier professional positions will require changing organizational processes and reducing unconscious biases in workplace interactions (e.g., Acker 1990; Correll et al. 2014; Heilman 2012; Kanter 1993). Until such sweeping changes are made, however, it is important to recognize that women's daily workplace practices may impact their career attainment, earnings, and satisfaction in predictable and unintended ways (Rudman and Phelan 2008).

DATA AND METHODS

We collected data for this project over two years (October 2013-September 2015) as part of a case study of a women's professional development program at a large multi-division nonprofit organization in the western United States.¹ The program was designed by the organization's Human Resources department in consultation with the research team to create gender awareness among women employees and equip them with tools for combating gender bias at work. Whether the program effectively equipped women to combat bias is not the focus of this paper. Instead, we treat the program as a unique site

for studying gender in the workplace, as program meetings were a space where women's professional attitudes, perceptions, and experiences were foregrounded.

Once the program launched, Human Resources took the organizational lead while the research team positioned ourselves as nonintrusive observers and interviewers. The HR team recruited women employees to serve as facilitators of discussion circles. These facilitators, in turn, recruited 5-10 other women employees to join their circles. In many cases, facilitators recruited members who shared a common characteristic or an interest in a common theme, such that there were circles organized for women with young children, women of color, and women dealing with aging parents. In other cases, facilitators tapped their professional networks to recruit diverse circles, whose only commonality was a shared interest in professional development. Across all circles, facilitators were expected to schedule seven meetings covering pre-determined topics, such as negotiation and implicit bias. Circle members watched an educational video before arriving at each meeting and spent approximately two hours during the meeting discussing their views and experiences related to the topic. The first program cohort convened from October 2013-June 2014 and included 140 women, while the second cohort met from October 2014-June 2015 and included 196 women (see Table 1 for participant characteristics).

<Table 1 about here>

Across each cohort, the research team collected systematic observational and interview data.² We selected three circles from each cohort to observe throughout the

year, chosen to capture diversity in terms of age, race/ethnicity, and career stage of participants. In Cohort 1, researchers followed 1) a circle of mid-career women of color, 2) a circle of predominantly white women advanced in their careers, and 3) a racially diverse circle of early career mothers with young children. For consistency, we selected circles to follow in Cohort 2 that matched these compositions as closely as possible. For each selected circle, one author attended and audio recorded all discussion meetings and wrote extensive field notes. In addition, each author interviewed the facilitators and three randomly selected members of the circle they followed at the start and end of the program. To capture the experiences of participants in circles that were not selected for observation, we attended program-wide trainings and social events and interviewed ten randomly selected participants at the start and end of the program. In total, we observed 36 circle meetings and 15 program-wide meetings. We conducted 86 interviews, including 41 participants interviewed at the start and end of the program and 4 interviewed once (see Table 2 for interview respondent characteristics). Interviews averaged about an hour and were audio recorded and professionally transcribed. The findings we present in this paper draw only from those respondents whom we both observed in circle meetings and with whom we conducted in-depth interviews, amounting to data from over 75 hours of observation and 66 interviews.

<Table 2 about here>

Observational and interview data were analyzed using the qualitative software package *Dedoose*. We analyzed the data using thematic analysis, an inductive form of analysis oriented toward identifying patterns in qualitative data (Charmaz 2003; Gibbs 2007). Select transcripts were read by all authors and discussed in analytical team meetings to ensure rigor and coder consistency. Using an inductive approach, we first developed an initial coding scheme to identify emergent topics and themes. We iteratively revised the coding scheme as additional interviews were coded. Multiple rounds of coding revealed a set of strategies that, drawing on our participants' own words, we identified as related to "invisibility." We probed the data to better understand the rationales motivating participants to seek invisibility. We mapped variation across participants' characteristics, engaging with existing theory and empirical research to contextualize workplace strategies.

Our data allowed us to track how women across varied backgrounds and identities navigate workplace barriers. Throughout our findings, we discuss how women's intersectional identities – including their race, sexual orientation, age, seniority, and education – inform their embrace of invisibility. However, we limit our focus in this paper to one key axis of variation: family composition. Across other characteristics, women with partners and children were drawn to conflict-avoidance in the workplace more consistently than their single and childless counterparts. While workplace navigation strategies vary across many dimensions of difference, we found familial demands to be the most commonly invoked rationale for remaining behind the scenes in the office.

243

244 FINDINGS

245 Our data reveal how women experience and interpret workplace barriers and, in
246 turn, seek to overcome them. We use the term “intentional invisibility” to describe a set
247 of strategies that professional women in our sample used to navigate the workplace while
248 remaining largely behind the scenes. While we use the term as an analytic category, our
249 use closely tracks how program participants described their own ideals and experiences.
250 Participants across the organization, in varying career and personal circumstances, drew
251 on strikingly similar strategies to avoid workplace conflict, attain a feeling of authenticity
252 within their professional roles, and balance work with familial responsibilities. While our
253 data cannot speak directly to the efficacy of the strategies women adopted with regards to
254 professional advancement, we demonstrate how the professional pathways women take
255 may lead to low visibility among women across an organization.

256

257 *Avoiding Conflict Within a Biased Structure*

258 The women in our study identified gendered barriers to advancement and job
259 satisfaction in multiple registers: workplace policies that conflicted with parental
260 responsibilities, supervisors and supervisees who conveyed gender biases, and double
261 standards embedded in performance evaluations, for example. In their unequal work
262 environments, women often reduced their visibility to avoid conflict, which they saw
263 threatening to distract from their core professional responsibilities. Diana, for instance,
264 works as a software engineer in a division of the organization where men are

265 overrepresented at the management level. More than once, she has walked into meetings
266 where the men around the table assume she is a secretary rather than an engineer. While
267 Diana recalls that these moments stressed her out when she was younger, as she's gained
268 experience and seniority she has come to "get a kick out of it." Now, she tries to advance
269 by "just being the professional person I need to be" instead of reacting to bias. Diana
270 explains, "I've never been a fan of, and I've never joined, like the Society for Women
271 Engineers... That seems counter to the cause, in my mind, like calling attention to things
272 in a way. We're just engineers, we don't have to be women in engineering." Diana
273 describes such groups as "self-isolating," and worries that advocating for women in her
274 field would detract from her core professional identity as an engineer. For Diana, keeping
275 a low profile and being quietly competent allows her to incrementally advance in her
276 career without risking the backlash or interactional discomfort that calling attention to her
277 presence as a woman might.

278 Similar to Diana's strategy for deflecting attention from her gender within a male-
279 dominated field, women across divisions of the organization sought to minimize the
280 visibility of feminine-typed "issues" such as pregnancy and maternity leave. Jane, who
281 works as an administrator in a male-dominated division, has a senior colleague who had a
282 baby on Wednesday and came back to work on Monday. Jane wondered about her
283 colleague's quick return, "Is it because it's a sexist environment? ... Is it because she feels
284 like she has to [come back to work immediately] to be able to compete as a woman? Or is
285 it just because she loves what she does and felt like she was up to it?" Jane's colleague
286 had the option of taking a longer maternity leave—in fact, the organization has a better

287 than average parental leave policy. Yet, in Jane's analysis, taking a longer leave might
288 have created a competitive disadvantage for her colleague "as a woman." Taking
289 advantage of ostensibly egalitarian policies like parental leave is fraught, and in Jane's
290 view, her colleague chose to navigate this gendered situation by creating as little
291 disruption as possible.

292 Women often tried to minimize their visibility specifically when they recognized
293 gender bias. In moments of heightened bias, many women—like Jane's colleague,
294 according to Jane—felt particularly vulnerable to backlash and did not want to stick out
295 as women. Gloria, for instance, has worked in a male-dominated field in corporate and
296 non-profit settings for the past thirty-five years. Gloria tells us that she has no doubt "that
297 strong women in the workplace are still perceived as bitches." She recognizes this
298 stereotype as unfair, and in the privacy of her circle voices her resistance to it. In her
299 office, though, rather than rebel, she has learned to adapt her own behavior, assuming a
300 more passive demeanor, to avoid the pejorative label: "One of my personal goals and
301 self-learning over the course of the past thirty-five years is that I had to moderate my very
302 strong personality and strong opinions on things."

303 When Gloria stays quiet in meetings or thanks her colleagues for doing things that
304 should be routine it is not because she is shy, lacks confidence, or is used to taking the
305 ingratiating position. Instead, she knowingly subdues what she considers her natural
306 tendency to come on strong for the sake of professional advancement. Gloria is far from
307 alone among the women we spoke to in reducing her visibility to avoid being perceived
308 as bitchy. Jackie describes filing a complaint about a supervisor's sexual harassment as a

309 “naïve” career mistake; Carly showed up for an office “clean-up party” that her male
310 supervisor had organized only to find that he had not bothered to show up and that the
311 only volunteer cleaners were women, but she wrote off the experience by saying that
312 while she “was a little bit frosted” she knows her boss is serially forgetful and that “we
313 all have our roles.” Though women routinely recognized gendered barriers in their
314 workplaces, they viewed quietly proceeding with work as the most strategic way of
315 responding.

316 Women like Gloria, Jackie, and Carly sought to minimize the gendered issues
317 they faced and to reduce their visibility as women in order to manage the complex, often
318 conflicting barriers and biases they encountered daily. Indeed, program participants
319 employed intentional invisibility in a range of everyday interactions, from team meetings
320 to office clean-ups, with bosses and the teams they managed. This strategy, though, was
321 most apparent when discussing workplace contexts where women were in leadership
322 positions. Women’s descriptions of their own leadership and their definitions of ideal
323 leadership often explicitly referred to invisibility as a goal to which they aspired. Whether
324 within their immediate work team, their division, the organization more broadly, or even
325 their family, women across both cohorts we tracked aimed to embody leadership without
326 putting themselves in the spotlight. For example, Martha, a supervisor who managed a
327 male-dominated division, explained, “...there is the stereotype of the leader, leading from
328 the front as opposed to pushing from the rear. And I think some people don’t necessarily
329 recognize what I will call ‘soft leadership.’” For Martha, soft leadership meant subtly
330 enabling others to succeed by pushing them towards goals. Stephanie likewise defined

331 leadership as an unselfish pursuit, saying “[A good leader is] a person that is not walking
332 out of the room taking all the credit, and really empowering others to be successful.”

333 By describing invisibility as a positive leadership characteristic, women were able
334 to assign value to the workplace strategies that they and their colleagues adopted to avoid
335 backlash. Janice, a woman in her 40s who holds a PhD, offers a definition of ideal
336 leadership that is typical of program participants: “Strong leadership is not only leading
337 by example, but in such a way that other people can learn it, other people can do it. And
338 the leader becomes part of a team. They become almost invisible, as part of the team—
339 except as a resource.” In Janice’s account, good leadership requires stepping aside to
340 allow others to advance. A good leader is available to help the team as a resource that
341 team members can utilize, but is otherwise indistinguishable from the team. Mary, a
342 technology services specialist, likewise noted, “I’ve seen people excel in leadership who
343 are in very invisible roles; they’re very much behind the scenes. But they are so good at
344 what they do, and they are so willing to go there, to do what needs to be done.” In Mary’s
345 account, an excellent leader is not a foreperson who delegates to a team and takes credit
346 for a finished project, but rather a worker doing unglamorous, unrecognized tasks.

347 Participants often recognized that the high value they placed on invisibility
348 contradicted organizational norms. Cathy has worked as a fundraiser long enough to see
349 time and again that “women, particularly, who are really efficient in their work, they get
350 stuff done, they meet their deadlines, they hit their numbers, they move things forward—
351 they get stuff done... when it comes to mind for them to think about a promotion they’re
352 passed over for those who maybe have a better sense of big picture.” Nevertheless, Cathy

353 says that one of the leadership skills she is working to develop is “[learning] to cover up
354 more, and shut my mouth once in a while.” Cathy defines ideal leadership in a way that
355 fits with her everyday workplace strategies for reducing her exposure to backlash. She
356 knows that earning a reputation as someone who quietly “gets stuff done” is not the
357 obvious path to promotion, but she defines her goals to align with the strategy of
358 invisibility, explaining, “I ultimately made the choice to kind of stop looking for
359 promotions and just find jobs that were rewarding to me.”

360 To craft careers that felt rewarding, women sought to reduce the chances for
361 interpersonal conflict and to increase opportunities for friendly relationships within their
362 work teams. Embracing invisibility within leadership positions facilitated these goals by
363 fostering collaboration and complemented other strategies for mitigating potential
364 conflicts with colleagues, such as excusing offensive remarks or softening critiques.
365 Thus, when a man said to Sharon after leaving a meeting, “God, I’m glad I’m not married
366 to you!” her takeaway was, “I must have been projecting more sternness than I knew I
367 was capable of.” She thereafter worked to change her conference room demeanor.
368 Maureen, for her part, embraced a definition of bias as a decision-making error after her
369 circle watched a video on the topic because it would give her a way to educate male
370 coworkers without accusing them of misconduct: “So you’re not saying to someone,
371 ‘You’re prejudiced.’ It doesn’t become such a negative. It just, it’s a way of looking at
372 things. You’re biased towards pink, not blue, or hair up vs. hair down.” Sharon, Maureen,
373 and their peers developed non-confrontational responses to gendered situations to limit

their vulnerability, and to define leadership in a way that incorporates intentional invisibility as a positive trait.

The Authenticity of Invisibility

In addition to mitigating the risk of interactional conflict, embracing invisibility offered a way for women in the program to reconcile professional and personal identities into an “authentic” self. Many women associated seeking visibility with aggressiveness or self-promotion, and they considered these traits to be at odds with their character and values. While discussing a professional development module about navigating power dynamics within workplace relationships, Nanette’s circle debated techniques for using body language to communicate authority. When a colleague proposes that taking up more space with grand gestures or erect posture could be helpful, Nanette rebuts by advocating for “just trying [different techniques] out and seeing what fits. I mean I’m never going to be big, I just never am.” Nanette concedes, “I could be bigger than I am. And maybe a little bit bigger would be helpful and useful,” but she attributes her usual passive body language to a personality characteristic that “just never” will be completely altered. “Being big” comes more easily to some of the other members of Nanette’s circle, but they nonetheless question whether it is a desirable behavior. When the group challenges the ethics of compensating for weak content with a confident presentation in a meeting, Gloria retorts, “I know men who do!” With her comment, Gloria suggests that perhaps circle members should lower their ethical standards to those of their male counterparts, but she also codes “being big” as a masculine behavior. Another circle member goes

396 further by describing “being big” in animalistic terms, likening the proposed strategy for
397 increasing visibility in meetings to the recommended strategy for warding off an
398 aggressive mountain lion. Women in this circle acknowledge that changing their body
399 language might increase their visibility and impact in meetings, but they reject the
400 strategy nonetheless as inauthentic, arguably unethical, and certainly unfeminine.

401 In lieu of “being big,” many women preferred to be less visible in order to remain
402 true to their authentic personalities and align their actions with their ethics. Karen, a mid-
403 level manager, explained that what differentiated authentic from inauthentic leadership
404 was humility: “Real leaders don’t really have to say what their title is, or have to brag
405 about their accolades or whatever. It is just inherent, and your work should speak for
406 itself.” For Karen and other women, discomfort with titles and self-promotion was also
407 supported by a belief that such approaches were signs of overcompensation. A member of
408 a different circle, Tanya, likewise said in an interview, “Not that there is anything wrong
409 with people who want to promote themselves and make money and have great titles—it’s
410 just that I was very uncomfortable with the word ‘leadership’ until I was able to redefine
411 it for myself.” Like many women interviewed, Tanya viewed the conventional definition
412 of leadership, and the form most commonly used in organizations, as including self-
413 promotion and a profit-driven mindset. While Tanya hedged that there was nothing
414 wrong with this style, her discomfort indicated otherwise. Other women discussed fears
415 of losing themselves if they took on a more executive style, often framing the latter as an
416 overly masculinized approach. For leadership to feel authentic to Tanya, it demanded less
417 selfish motives.

418 Similarly, during a circle meeting, Maxine described herself as a person “who
419 values integrity and authenticity.” To that end, she questioned whether she could be both
420 authoritative and likable as a leader, concluding that she wanted her team to think, “We
421 are so fair that you should want to view us as authentic and approachable, but you should
422 also respect us and not push us to be authoritative with you.” In Maxine’s view, being
423 authoritative was a last resort and could be avoided through a fair, authentic,
424 approachable workplace style. As a leader, Maxine believed that if she was well-liked
425 and respected, such behaviors would serve the same end as being directly authoritative. A
426 third circle member from senior management in Development, Lucy, explained that she
427 didn’t want women to have to take on the characteristics of men in the workplace. These
428 characteristics may involve being more authoritative, she told us, but they would drive
429 her crazy because they are “cold and rational, and they aren’t compelling, passionate or
430 interesting.” For Maxine, Tanya and Lucy, elements of what they viewed as a masculine
431 workplace style felt similarly wrong. Maxine recoiled from authoritarianism, Tanya could
432 only see herself as a leader according to an alternative definition that excluded self-
433 promotion and monetary motives, and Lucy regarded executive leadership as cold and
434 boring.

435 But an adoption of intentional invisibility was not just about framing traditional,
436 executive workplace behaviors as inauthentic. For many women, framing success in the
437 workplace to comply with feminine norms was fitting. Women are normatively expected
438 to be communal rather than individualistic (Eagly and Carli 2008), and our participants’
439 descriptions of the mechanics and goals of a good workplace reflected this expectation.

440 The norm that women ought to be communal bore on how participants thought managers
441 should oversee their teams. Louise, who supervises a small team in Human Resources,
442 explained that teams should be talented and diverse, and that leaders should not enforce a
443 hierarchical order. Louise believes that she should prioritize the group over the potential
444 personal gains of ascending a hierarchy.

445 Likewise, the communal orientation that Louise refers to shapes the *why* of
446 intentional invisibility. In her interview, Louise explained that non-hierarchical,
447 collaborative groups are ideal because, “whatever the mission of the group or the
448 organization [is, it] can be best realized by having that really strong, supported group.”
449 Other participants agreed that leaders should pursue organizational goals rather than seek
450 self-promotion. Program participants further espoused this mission-oriented, communal
451 approach to leadership by contrasting it with a more executive, self-promoting style.
452 Janine, a mid-level manager, explains that she has trouble respecting leaders who do not
453 put others first: “[Leaders] can really have just the most brilliant idea, but if it’s at the
454 expense of people it doesn’t do anything for me.” Similarly, Robyn, in senior
455 management, notes that a professional approach that values promotion and self-
456 advancement makes her uncomfortable: “Even women who are very career-oriented
457 aren’t necessarily the most satisfied from those type of positions, and their goal is not
458 necessarily endless promotion.” Robyn goes on to explain that women leaders may
459 approach their work differently than men. “[Women] are not always going to consider
460 something a win just if we got more of something numbers-wise. A lot of us are in this
461 because of something that’s more heart-related.”

462 According to Robyn, while men may rely more heavily on numbers and statistics
463 as markers of success, women value and measure their professional success in other
464 ways. This sentiment is reflected in responses we heard throughout interviews,
465 suggesting that women reject masculine-typed workplace behaviors in favor of a more
466 communal and less self-promotional work style. Together, distaste for masculine
467 workplace behaviors and a preference for a communal approach made *invisibility* the
468 most effective tool at many women's disposal. And by positioning invisibility as
469 intentional, authentic and effective, the women in our sample were rejecting—rather than
470 failing at—professional advancement.

471 Other women dealt with similar deliberations between the leadership they saw
472 around them and the leadership that they wished to embody themselves. Again, key to
473 this negotiation between ideal and actual was the tool of invisibility. Meredith, a circle
474 member who worked in Health Services, says that she is comfortable being outspoken.
475 She is not sure, however, that being “the person in the room who says the thing that
476 everyone else is thinking” is an effective strategy. “Maybe the goal for me is to figure out
477 how to be smart about [speaking out]; how to be more political about it, without losing
478 my voice and without getting burned out.” Meredith values speaking her mind and has
479 the skills to do so, but senses that it might stunt her career advancement. Earlier, she
480 practiced a more assertive, visible workplace style, but in the face of negative feedback is
481 seeking to learn a less visible strategy. Others who generally turn to behind the scenes
482 strategies likewise justify the choice by arguing that a direct, executive style would be
483 self-defeating. Amy, a mid-level employee, explains that she has a difficult boss: he

484 neither thrives as a manager nor completes his own work successfully. Rather than
485 confronting him, Amy shares with her circle that she is “controlling her boss by playing
486 low, by being ingratiating... Sometimes you do it strategically and it elevates your
487 status.” Rather than risk repercussions for directly addressing her boss’s insufficiencies,
488 Amy uses an invisible tactic to improve her professional standing.

489 Even when women’s behaviors aligned with executive norms, they tended to
490 humbly re-frame their strategies as examples of invisibility. Gretchen, a senior
491 administrator, admires a woman who can take control but maintain “the niceness of it, the
492 dealing with people [kindly].” While few would object to managers treating team
493 members kindly, Gretchen’s admiration for control tempered with niceness reminds her
494 that she ought “to take a step back, because I tend to control.” Even for a leader, control
495 was to be softened or modulated, rather than embraced. Likewise, even though April
496 finds an executive negotiation style to be effective when shopping for a car, she feels
497 uncomfortable breaching interactional norms with her assertiveness. April recounted to
498 her circle that she approached the male salesperson at the car dealership in a very
499 authoritative manner that was “not her” at all, and she ended up getting a very cheap deal.
500 However, after the deal was made she apologized to the male salesperson because she felt
501 she had emasculated him. She thought to herself, “I’m being such a bitch!” and felt she
502 had to apologize and explain that this was not really her, but was the game she had to
503 play. The executive style that April and Gretchen’s co-worker employed adhered to the
504 rules of the game and proved effective, but was interpreted by the women as inauthentic

505 and unethical. April and Gretchen, like many women in the program, would prefer to
506 minimize their guilt and ambivalence by practicing a less assertive behavioral strategy.

507 Other women feared the reactions of their team members were they to take on a
508 more confrontational, assertive style. Sally, who holds a PhD and oversees an IT Services
509 team, recounted a time when she confronted her colleagues about an issue with a project
510 and worried she was “being an ass.” Sally’s circle members and workplace peers
511 reassured her that she was in the right when she stood up for herself, but she nonetheless
512 cites the experience as a time “when I felt first-hand the extent of the double standard for
513 women who are otherwise reserved.” Program participants experienced or witnessed
514 interactions where women who too visibly took control were sanctioned. As a result,
515 invisibility was not necessarily a default, but rather became an intentional strategy that
516 women employed to avoid backlash or a feeling of inauthenticity.

518 *The Paradox of the Modern Partnership*

519 The women in our sample spanned a number of characteristics including age,
520 race, and career stage. Yet among these characteristics, family composition stood out as
521 the central differentiator of women’s leadership strategies, with mothers with children at
522 home most strongly embracing invisibility. For many women who participated in the
523 professional development program, remaining behind the scenes was an intentional
524 strategy for navigating workplace biases. But for women with families, intentional
525 invisibility offered, in addition, a vital way of ensuring stable employment and a stable
526 family life.

527 Carly, who was married with two young children, exemplified this balancing act.
528 Carly was unhappy in her current job. After returning from maternity leave, she reduced
529 her hours to 75% but felt that she still had a full-time workload and decreased status
530 within her department. Carly wanted to go back to working full-time but told her circle
531 that she had not “acclimated the husband yet.” Her husband was working freelance in the
532 technology sector, and therefore had a flexible schedule, but Carly did not want to limit
533 his career opportunities by saddling him with responsibilities like transporting the kids
534 between activities. Even though Carly earned substantially more than her husband, she
535 thought “his per capita rate of income would be really high in theory—but that is only if
536 he actually got a job.” While she laughed about his sporadic employment with her circle,
537 she also structured her career around his risky path. She maintained a flexible but low
538 status 75% schedule with a reliable salary and benefits in the hope that her husband might
539 win big by joining a start-up tech company. She served as her family’s breadwinner, but
540 endured career dissatisfaction and low mobility in order to meet her family’s needs.
541 Carly’s position as a caretaker constrained her from pushing for a full-time, high status
542 role in her organization or elsewhere.

543 Like Carly, Sandra curtailed an upward professional trajectory to better reconcile
544 her professional and familial responsibilities. Sandra had moved from a corporate job to
545 the non-profit sector and was thriving in an upper-level administrative position. However,
546 when one of her children was diagnosed with a medical condition that would require
547 more hands-on adult supervision, she moved to a lower stress, and lower prestige, staff
548 position within the organization. Sandra, like her husband, continued to work full-time.

549 Her salary and benefits remained integral to her family. But in scaling back her
550 ambitions, she felt more capable of creating the mental and emotional space for managing
551 her family's evolving needs. Sandra and Carly, like many of their peers, took for granted
552 that they would maintain employment throughout marriage and childrearing. They also
553 shared an accompanying assumption that they could outsource many household
554 responsibilities, including childcare, to maintain a full-time work schedule. While these
555 women differ from those a generation ago who might have left the workforce to care for
556 their families, they nonetheless continue to bear the gendered burden of maintaining
557 family stability by being constantly available to deal with caretaking and family
558 contingencies. To do so, they crafted careers around flexibility and stability while their
559 husbands pursued riskier, and potentially more rewarding, ambitions.

560 Some women feared or had experienced backlash from their partners if they
561 started valuing ambition or risk-taking in their careers. Mary's story is emblematic of this
562 dynamic. Mary, who had a husband and two young children, felt increasingly empowered
563 over the course of the program. After years in middle management, she had recently
564 discovered and hoped to act on a desire to climb the professional ladder. However, during
565 her circle's fourth meeting, Mary came in with a "cautionary story" for the group. Since
566 joining the group, she had put into practice and begun to move full-speed ahead with her
567 professional development plans. Mary explained, however, that this new approach to her
568 career had jolted things at home:

569 *In my mind, I was becoming the person I wanted to be. I was taking*
570 *professional development classes and talking to people and practicing it in*
571 *my real life. And one day, I saw my husband getting increasingly upset*
572 *with me. So finally I said to him, 'Did I do something?!' and he said, 'I*

573 *don't even know who you are anymore! You're making all of these plans,*
574 *you're talking about going back to school, you're doing this and that, and*
575 *you're not present, you're not here for us. We used to talk about things*
576 *that would impact the two of us.' I realized in that moment, 'Oh, I guess*
577 *there's a reality.'*

578
579 Mary's spouse felt disturbed and alienated by his wife's increasingly ambitious career
580 aspirations. While Mary continued to participate in the program, a change in her fervor
581 and demeanor was noticeable following this event.

582 Similarly, Divya, who holds a Ph.D. and directs a division within the
583 organization, explicitly articulates the challenges of balancing professional aspirations
584 with personal responsibilities. She feels that the expectations of her as a wife and a
585 mother precluded her from being able to focus on and achieve her career goals:

586 *I think that if I had been a man, I would perhaps been able to achieve*
587 *more professionally. And that's for no other reason except holding myself*
588 *back, too. And there's also the biological thing. You know, you have a kid,*
589 *you step out of the workplace. You have a spouse who has a professional*
590 *career. You sort of support many things in your life without putting your*
591 *profession first [...] I think we're talking about single-minded focus on*
592 *your career. And I think that for me, being a woman and taking on all the*
593 *expected roles, that I have never focused single-mindedly on my work.*
594 *There are lots of competing things: walking the dog, making sure the kids*
595 *are fine; you know, making sure you have dinner or cleaning up after*
596 *dinner. You know, keep up 101 things in mind.*

597
598 Compared to women with children, we found that women who did not have
599 families to support approached their careers with less risk aversion. A sizeable minority
600 of circle participants who fit these criteria noted concerns other than stability and
601 flexibility when discussing their careers. While they too embraced invisible leadership
602 and expressed worries about being inauthentic or unlikable if they practiced executive
603 leadership, concerns for these women about job security and flexibility were largely

absent. These women were also aware of their comparative freedom to pursue their careers. Larissa, a rising mid-level manager in her late 30s, discussed how much easier it was for her to work long hours and get ahead compared to her female colleagues who were also mothers. As she and her spouse had decided not to have children, she felt freed to make riskier “reach” decisions with her own career.

For women with children, invisibility was one deliberate tool for managing conflicting expectations. Within the modern partnership, women are free to, and indeed may be required to, pursue a career. However, many find that they can only pursue their ambitions to a point to ensure stability. Specifically, in order to continue with their careers while also meeting familial obligations, these women selected an invisible style that allowed them to be effective workers while staying out of the spotlight and avoiding negative backlash both in and out of the workplace.

DISCUSSION

Most of the women in our study were highly educated, middle and upper class professionals from dual-income households. Many identified as leaders in their careers and had access to outsourced help for their household and care work. Yet, even among this self-selected set of ambitious and advantaged women, we found that many embraced “intentional invisibility.” Despite being aware of executive professional styles, these women found that a less visible approach to navigating the workplace helped them maintain their professional position without putting it at risk.

Our findings shed light on broader trends in women's career advancement, deepening our understanding of how and why women's professional and economic gains in recent decades have not been commensurate with their human capital. Scholars largely agree that pervasive, structural problems underpin women's underrepresentation. At work, women face a labyrinth riddled with biases, discrimination, and other obstacles throughout their careers (Ely, Ibarra, and Kolb 2011; Monroe and Chiu 2010). At home, women continue to share a disproportionate burden of familial and caregiving responsibilities (Bianchi et al. 2000, 2012; Coverman 1983; Sayer 2005; Sayer, Bianchi and Robinson 2004). We show that women embrace invisibility as a conflict-avoidant strategy that allows them to feel authentic and maintain stability at work and home without challenging feminine expectations. Our findings suggest that regardless of the impact intentional invisibility may have on career advancement the long run, the strategy appeals to diverse women who find themselves caught within biased organizations.

To resolve the puzzle wherein professional women limit their own visibility, we show first that the women in our study encountered bias, backlash, and constraints in their workplace environments. Participants described a range of non-confrontational and vulnerability-minimizing "invisible" responses that they had developed to counter inequality and interactional discomfort in the workplace. But unlike other forms of executive workplace norms that felt inauthentic, navigating the labyrinth in this way allowed these women to accomplish organizational goals while also avoiding the backlash that individual self-promotion or assertiveness might have engendered.

We additionally demonstrate that despite being ambitious and career driven, the women in our study approached their work with an eye to fortifying their families for possible contingencies. Indeed, our data show how the responsibility many women bear for ensuring the wellbeing of their families serves as a multi-level barrier that encourages them to stay out of the spotlight. For example, women like Sandra and Carly took for granted that they would have careers through marriage and childrearing with access to paid help to maintain a full-time work schedule. However, both women also bore the burden of maintaining family stability and being available to deal with contingencies in ways that their husbands simply did not. Women saw their career stability as a way of freeing their husbands or partners to pursue riskier, but potentially more lucrative or fulfilling, opportunities. Together, the personal and organizational pressures that these women faced made invisibility an optimal strategy.

Still, while we suggest that intentional invisibility may have consequences for individual women's advancement and gender parity in the workplace more broadly, our conclusions are tempered by our awareness of selection challenges and methodological limitations. First, our study precludes us from examining all the dimensions along which workplace navigation strategies might differ for women from different backgrounds and intersectional identities. The women who participated in the professional development program were predominantly white and middle or upper class, and had opted to work within the same large organization. Likewise, because women self-selected into the organizationally-sanctioned program, our research design could have led us to observe women less inclined than others to challenge the gender norms in their workplace. Given

selection bias, we acknowledge that invisibility might not be a dominant strategy for all women, but rather, a strategy preferred by status-conforming women less interested in “rocking the boat.” We hope that future research on organizational interventions and inequality will be attentive to the interpretive and behavioral strategies that diverse women employ across unequal settings.

In addition, we did not track long-term career outcomes and thus cannot speak to the causal impacts of invisibility. To the extent that this workplace strategy contradicts conventional professional norms, invisibility could stymie the career advancement of those who practice it; indeed, many participants who embraced invisibility were concerned about this consequence. However, it could be that this invisible, communal approach to work creates effective teams and successful organizations, and will therefore benefit women professionals in the long-term. Our findings suggest that regardless of the causal effects this strategy may have in the long run, intentional invisibility offers women an effective, adaptable set of strategies to maintain both professional and personal stability as well as feelings of authenticity and femininity.

While our data are not representative and do not speak to invisibility’s long-term effectiveness, our findings suggest that women within biased organizations construct and employ novel strategies for reconciling professional and personal demands. By shifting attention away from barriers themselves and towards the women who negotiate them, we point to how the daily choices women make in the workplace bear on their sense of self and sense of stability. While women may seek to stay out of the spotlight in the

workplace, here we highlight how their preferences and decisions contribute to gender dynamics in the office and at home.

CONCLUSION

Although scholars of gender and leadership have a strong theoretical grasp on the ways in which organizations fail women, they have a weaker understanding of how women internalize and respond to these organizational constraints in ways that influence their career outcomes. Our analysis of women's aspirations and decision-making highlights both the nature of the challenges women encounter as well as the tools they can leverage to navigate these challenges. Particularly, in tracking women's professional aspirations alongside the strategies they employ daily to navigate workplace responsibilities and relationships, we find that women's use of "intentional invisibility" helps them as they continually confront and navigate maze-like barriers to professional advancement. Together, our findings demonstrate the importance of workplace policies that not only level the playing field, but also recognize the gendered baggage and toolkits that employees bring to the workplace.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society* 4 (2): 139-58.
- Alvesson, M. and Billing, Y. (1997). *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. London. Sage

711 Belkin, L. (2003). The Opt-Out Revolution. *The New York Times*, October 26.

712 Bianchi, S., Sayer, L., Milkie, M. and Robinson, J. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or
713 will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces* 91(1): 55-63.

714 Blair-Loy, M. (2009). *Competing Devotions: Career and Family Among Women*
715 *Executives*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

716 Britton, D. (2000). The Epistemology of the Gendered Organization. *Gender and Society*
717 14(1): 418-434.

718 Cech, E., and M. Blair-Loy (2010). Perceiving Glass Ceilings? Meritocratic versus
719 Structural Explanations of Gender Inequality among Women in Science and
720 Technology. *Social Problems* 57(3): 371-397.

721 Charmaz, K. (2003). 'Grounded Theory', in J.A. Smith (ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A*
722 *Practical Guide to Research Methods*. London: Sage.

723 Coltrane, S. (1996). *Family Man: Fatherhood, Household and Gender Equity*. New
724 York. Oxford University Press.

725 Cooper, M. (2000). Being the "Go-To-Guy": Fatherhood, Masculinity, and the
726 Organization of Work in Silicon Valley. *Qualitative Sociology*. 23(1): 379-405.

727 Correll, S., Kelly, E., Trimble, L. and Williams, J. (2014). Redesigning, Redefining
728 Work. *Work and Occupations* 41 (1): 3-17.

729 Correll, S., Benard, S. and Paik, I. (2007). Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood
730 Penalty? *American Journal of Sociology* 112 (5): 1297-1339.

731 Correll, S. (2001). Gender and the Career Choice Process: The Role of Biased Self-
732 Assessments. *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (6): 1691-1730.

- 733 Correll, S. (2004). Constraints into Preferences: Gender, Status, and Emerging Career
734 Aspirations. *American Sociological Review* 69(1): 93-113.
- 735 Correll, S. and Mackenzie, L. (2016). To Succeed in Tech, Women Need More Visibility.
736 *Harvard Business Review*, September 13, 2016. Available at
737 <https://hbr.org/2016/09/to-succeed-in-tech-women-need-more-visibility> [Last
738 Accessed February 27, 2017]
- 739 Cotter, D., Hermsen, J. and Vanneman, R. (2004). *Gender Inequality at Work*. New
740 York. Russell Sage Foundation.
- 741 Coverman, S. (1983). Gender, domestic labor time, and wage inequality. *American*
742 *Sociological Review*, 1983 (1): 623-637.
- 743 Davies-Netzley, S. (1998). Women above the Glass Ceiling: Perceptions on Corporate
744 Mobility and Strategies for Success. *Gender and Society* 12 (3): 339-55.
- 745 DeRue, D. and Ashford, S. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process
746 of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management*
747 *Review* 35 (4): 627-647.
- 748 Eagly, A. and Carli, L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business*
749 *Review* 85 (9): 62-71.
- 750 Eagly, A. and Carli, L. (2008). *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth about How Women*
751 *Become Leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- 752 Elliot, J. and Smith, R. (2004). Race, Gender and Workplace Power. *American*
753 *Sociological Review*. 69: 365-386.

- 754 Ely, R. and Rhode, D. (2010). Women and Leadership. In: Nitin Nohria and Rakesh
755 Khurana, eds., *Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice: An HBS centennial*
756 *colloquium on advancing leadership..* 1st ed. Cambridge. Harvard Business
757 Review Press, pp. 377-410.
- 758 Ely, R., Ibarra, H. and Kolb, D. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design
759 for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of Management*
760 *Learning & Education* 10 (3): 474-493.
- 761 Glass, J. (2004). Blessing or Curse? Work-Family Policies and Mother's Wage Growth
762 Over Time. *Work and Occupations* 31(1): 367-94.
- 763 Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Thematic coding and categorizing. *Analyzing Qualitative Data*.
764 London: SAGE Publications.
- 765 Goldin, C. (2006). The Quiet Revolution that Transformed Women's Employment,
766 Education, and Family. *NBER Working Paper Series*. Cambridge, MA: National
767 Bureau of Economic Research.
- 768 Gorman, E. and Kmec, J. (2009). Hierarchical Rank and Women's Organizational
769 Mobility: Glass Ceilings in Corporate Law Firms. *American Journal of Sociology*.
770 114: 1428-1474.
- 771 Heilman, M. (2012). Gender stereotypes and workplace bias. *Research in Organizational*
772 *Behavior* 32: 113-35.
- 773 Heilman, M. Wallen, A., Fuchs, D. and Tamkins, M. (2004). Penalties for Success:
774 Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied*
775 *Psychology* 89 (3): 416-427.

776 Helgesen, S. (1990). *The Female Advantage*. New York. Doubleday.

777 Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*.
 778 New York: Viking.

779 Hochschild, A. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes*
 780 *Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

781 Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional Selves: Experimenting With Image and Identity in
 782 Professional Adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 44(4): 764-791.

783 Ibarra, H. (2012). To Close the Gender Gap, Focus On Assignments. *Harvard Business*
 784 *Review*, May 22, 2012. Available at [https://hbr.org/2012/05/to-close-the-gender-](https://hbr.org/2012/05/to-close-the-gender-gap-focus-on-assignments)
 785 [gap-focus-on-assignments](https://hbr.org/2012/05/to-close-the-gender-gap-focus-on-assignments) [Last Accessed February 27, 2017]

786 Ibarra, H., Ely, R. and Kolb, D. (2013). Women Rising: The Unseen Barriers. *Harvard*
 787 *Business Review*.

788 Ibarra, H and Petriglieri, J. (2007). Impossible Selves: Image Strategies and Identity
 789 Threat in Professional Women's Career Transitions. *Unpublished article*,
 790 *INSEAD*.

791 Jacobs, J., and Gerson, K. (2004). *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender*
 792 *Inequality*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

793 Kanter, R. (1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York. Basic Books.

794 Kellogg, K. (2011). *Challenging Operations: Medical Reform and Resistance in Surgery*.
 795 Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

796 Kelly, E., Ammons, S., Chermack, K., and Moen, P. (2010). Gendered Challenge,
 797 Gendered Response: Confronting the Ideal Worker Norm in a White Collar
 798 Organization. *Gender & Society* 24(1): 281-303.
 799 Kendall, S. and Tannen, D. (1997). Gender and Language in the Workplace. In: Ruth
 800 Wodak, ed., *Gender and Discourse*, 1st ed. London. Sage, pp. 81-105.
 801 King, M.M., Bergstrom, C.T., Correll, S.J., Jacquet, J., and West, J.D. (2017). Men Set
 802 Their Own Cites High: Gender and Self-Citation Across Fields and Over Time.
 803 *Socius* 3: 1-22.
 804 Kolb, D. (2013). Negotiated in the Shadows of Organizations: Gender, Negotiation, and
 805 Change. *Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol.* 28: 241-60.
 806 Kulis, S., Sicotte, D. and Collins, S. (2002). More than a pipeline problem: Labor supply
 807 constraints and gender stratification across academic science
 808 disciplines. *Research in Higher Education* 43 (6): 657-691.
 809 Leahey, E. (2007). Not By Productivity Alone: How Visibility and Specialization
 810 Contribute to Academic Earnings. *American Sociological Review.* 72(4): 533-61.
 811 Miller, J. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston. Beacon Press.
 812 Monroe, K. and Chiu, W. (2010). Gender Equality in the Academy: The Pipeline
 813 Problem. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (2): 303-8.
 814 Pratt, M.G., Rockmann, K.W., Kaufmann, J.B. (2006). Constructing Professional
 815 Identity: The Role of Work and Identity Learning Cycles in the Customization of
 816 Identity Among Medical Residents. *Academy of Management Journal.* 49(2):
 817 235-262.

- 818 Ramarajan, L., Reid, E.M. (2013). Shattering the Myth of Separate Worlds: Negotiating
819 Non-Work Identities at Work. *Academy of Management Review* 38(4): 621-644.
- 820 Ramarajan, L., Reid, E.M. (2016). Managing the High Intensity Workplace. *Harvard*
821 *Business Review* 94(6): 84-90.
- 822 Reid, E.M. (2015). Embracing Passing, Revealing, and the Ideal Worker Image: How
823 People Navigate Expected and Experienced Professional Identities.
824 *Organizational Science* 1: 13.
- 825 Ridgeway, C. and Correll, S. (2004). Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical
826 Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Expectations. *Gender and Society* 18
827 (4): 510-31.
- 828 Rudman, L. and Phelan, J. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes
829 in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 28: 61-79.
- 830 Rudman, L. and Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward
831 agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (4): 743-762.
- 832 Rudman L. A., Phelan J. E., Nauts S., Moss-Racusin C. A. (2012). Status incongruity and
833 backlash toward female leaders: defending the gender hierarchy motivates
834 prejudice against female leaders. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 48: 165–179.
- 835 Sayer, L. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work,
836 unpaid work and free time. *Social forces*, 84(1): 285-303.
- 837 Sayer, L., Suzanne, B. and John, R. (2004). Are Parents Investing Less in Children?
838 Trends in Mothers' and Fathers' Time With Children. *American Journal of*
839 *Sociology*. 110: 1–43.

840 Simmard, C., Davies, A., Gilmartin, S., Shiebinger, L. and Whitney, T. (2008). *Climbing*
841 *the technical ladder: obstacles and solutions for mid-level women in technology*.
842 [online] Clayman Institute of Gender Research. Available at:
843 <http://gender.stanford.edu/climbing-technical-ladder-0> [Last Accessed February
844 27, 2017]

845 Williams, J. (2000). *Why work and family conflict and what to do about it*. New York.
846 Oxford University Press.

847 Williams, J. and Dempsey, R. (2014). *What works for women at work: Four patterns*
848 *working women need to know*. New York. NYU Press.

849 Yee, L., Krivkovich, T., Finch, A., Kutcher, E., Cooper, M., Epstein, B. and Konar,
850 Ellen. (2016). *Women in the Workplace 2016* [online]. Lean In and
851 McKinsey&Company. Available at <https://womenintheworkplace.com/> [Accessed
852 27 February, 2017].

853

853

854 ENDNOTES

855 1. Women who participated in the professional development program were assured of
856 confidentiality by both the Human Resources Department and the research team, and
857 their discussion groups served as spaces for sharing personal experiences. Because of
858 the importance of maintaining confidentiality, key details about the organization and
859 program we studied are obscured throughout this article, and all names are
860 pseudonyms.

861 2. In addition to observational and interview data, the research team fielded surveys at
862 the beginning and end of the program to track changes in participants' views. Survey
863 data are available upon request, but do not inform the findings reported in this paper.

864

865

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of program participants by cohort.

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Age (mean)	46	40
Parent [†]	70%	53%
Relationship Status [†]		
Single/Non-cohabiting	17%	29%
Cohabiting	12%	9%
Married	71%	62%
Race ^{††}		
White	68%	76%
Black	3%	5%
Asian	10%	11%
Hispanic	7%	1%
Other - All other responses	1%	2%
Multiple responses	11%	6%
Hispanic	-	11%
Education		
High School	0	0
Associate's/Some college	1%	4%
Bachelor's	17%	34%
Master's	54%	44%
PhD or Professional	29%	18%
Years in organization (mean) [†]	10	7
Manages others	73%	63%
Income ^{†††}		
0-49,999	-	3%
50-99,999	-	52%
100-149,999	-	32%
150,000 or greater	-	12%
N	138	177

[†] Among Cohort 1, parental status, relationship status, and organizational tenure were only asked on the post-program survey, which 86 participants completed.

^{††} Cohort 1 participants saw "Hispanic" as an available race category and were not asked separately about Hispanic origin. Cohort 2 participants were asked to report their race and Hispanic origin separately; for Cohort 2 participants, the race category "Hispanic" includes those who selected "Some other race (please specify)" and wrote in "Hispanic," "Latina," etc. as their race.

^{†††} Cohort 1 participants were not asked to report their income.

Table 2. Interview respondent characteristics.

Age (mean)	45
Parent	71%
Relationship Status	
Single/Non-cohabiting/Divorced	24%
Cohabiting	7%
Married	69%
Race [†]	
White	47%
Black	4%
Asian	9%
Hispanic	13%
Other - All other responses	4%
Multiple responses	2%
Education ^{††}	
High School/Some college	4%
Bachelor's	36%
Master's	36%
PhD or Professional	22%
Years in organization (mean)	11
N ^{†††}	45

[†]Interview respondents were asked to self-report their race or ethnicity at the end of the interview. Nine respondents (20%) either opted not to self-report race or were not asked to.

^{††}Educational attainment is missing for one interview respondent.

^{†††}Interviews were conducted with 45 unique program participants. Of these, 4 respondents completed a single interview and 41 respondents completed interviews at the start and end of the program, for a total of 86 interviews.

867

868